

**From:** larzgold  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 11/16/01 10:55pm  
**Subject:** Microsoft Settlement

After reading as many articles about the settlement I am still wondering what the government won on this. Microsoft has to tell everyone the API to windows except when it is a security issue. Which is undefined. They are not penalized for anything past wrong doings, and are not forced to support older applications. Hence they can come out with office xp2 and say hey are no longer fixing bugs/updates in the previous version, and basically have income for life.

I am not anti-microsoft, in fact I am a shareholder, a developer of MS applications and write articles on how to convert Perl base applications to MS ASP/COM. But my fear lies with the fact the microsoft needs competition to better itself, and to give users a better choice. Forcing me to buy OfficeXP upgrade now, or pay a higher price later, well now I am moving to Star Office. Don't car companies have to support a car for so many years after making them, and can have recalls etc. Software may not kill anyone like a car might, but companies can go broke with the licensing they are enforced on them.

The best letter explaining what is wrong is the Ralph Nader letter.

Personally I would like to see a fund setup for open source/competitor software funded for the next 10 years, and also for them to have to open source any software they stop supporting. For example, when win95 is no longer supported an users have to upgrade, make the code open. This will allow computer companies, and hardware companies to continue to support the product after msft gives up support.

I hope you re-evaluate the decision very carefully.

Larzgold@yahasp.org